

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of May 19, 2015 Meeting

Jonathan Bahr opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:06 p.m. on Tuesday, May 19, 2015.

Present: Chad Askew, Jonathan Bahr, Rob Belisle, Tom Brasse, Melanie Coyne, Bernice Cutler, Travis Haston, Hal Hester, Rodney Kiser, Scott Shelton, Ben Simpson, John Taylor and Wanda Towler

Absent: All BDC Members present

1. MINUTES APPROVED

Travis Haston made the motion to approve the BDC Meeting Minutes from the April 21st meeting; seconded by Bernice Cutler. The motion passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES

No BDC Member issues

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

No public attendee issues.

Housekeeping Items

Jim Bartl introduced Ted Panagiotopoulos, the new Mecklenburg County Fire Marshal. Angie Traylor was introduced as the new Senior Quality and Training Specialist by Patrick Granson, and Steve Pearson was introduced as the new Code Enforcement Manager for the South Inspection Team.

BDC Members were invited to the State of the Department address being held on Thursday, May 21st at 7:00 a.m. in the Ed Woods Auditorium.

4. BUILDING SAFETY MONTH

Jim Bartl and Shannon Clubb described the BOCC proclamation supporting Building Safety Month; scheduled to pass at the 5/19/15 BOCC meeting. Building Safety month will be featured on MeckPermit.com, social media channels, newsletters as well as educational outreach during the month of May. The below listed Code Heroes were recognized and presented an award of appreciation by Jim Bartl.

- Ed Horne, former BDC Member and Electrical Contractor
- Facilities Management Team at Carolinas HealthCare System, participants in our BIM-IPD pilot
- Davidson Town Manager, Leamon Brice
- NARI of Greater Charlotte

5. FIELD REORG CONCEPT

Jim discussed challenges and benefits noted on April 21st and then discussed benefits of the 2015 reorg sharing that the reorg will build a targeted resource for most complex projects, and MF. Will elevate consistency and align with code development in NC; residential is more specialized than in 2010. Below is a summary of the 2014 inspection counts converted into customer service demand.

- Residential 165,000
- Commercial 86,000
- Total 251,000

- Commercial inspections:
- Mega/MF 25,000 (13,600 MF - + mega estimate -11,000 +/-)
- Other 61,000
- Total 86,000

Team composition and phasing; exclusive of filling vacant positions is as follows:

- Phase 1:
- Mega/MF.....4 bldg + 4 elec + 2 mech + 2 plbg = 12 inspectors total
- North Team.....34 inspectors
- South Team.....36 inspectors (N&S teams will 13.74 insp/day*)
- Total 82

- Phase 2:
- Mega/MF.....(*) 5 bldg + 6 elec + 3 mech + 3 plbg = 17 inspectors total
- Other Com'l Team.....(*) at least 19 inspectors (averages 13.66 insp/day*)
- Residential Team.....(*) at least 51 inspectors (averages 13.76 insp/day*)
- Total 87
- Note (*): subject to making progress on filling current inspector vacancies

- Phase 3:
- Mega/MF inspections team combines with Mega Plan Review Team

Note: BEMP trades historically average 13 inspections/inspector/day, over 235 work days/year (*).

The phasing implementation schedule is as follows:

- Phase 1; June 29 (noting last two weeks are required to have mega backup in place)
- Phase 2; tentative March 31, 2016
- Phase 3; tentative January 1-July 1, 2017

RB: Is mega multifamily same amount of inspections 13 and change?

JB: In terms of time requirements, not all these inspections are equal in time. When taking the big projects out of this the rest of commercial is very close to same scale.

RB: 1 hour allocated per inspection?

JB: We think you have to stay away from hours and focus on service demand per project.

TB: Why is it the city doesn't delegate fire inspection authority to the county fire marshal and city handles it themselves, with separate fire review?

JB: Because that is how it is written in the inter-local agreements. They will perform the work that is integrated in the PI process. On Fire side, the County has local agreements for Fire Marshal's side.

BC: Is it materially different?

JB: Two code cycles ago where they rewrote chapters 9 of the building code and fire prevention code making them very similar to each other. Worked with Fire Marshal at that time on redundancy. FM office is responsible for enforcing NC Fire Prevention Code w/ requirements for new construction and continuing inspection responsibility.

BS: When you move to the next phase; what pitfalls happen to other teams when taking away resources?

JB: Communication, training, technology. Similar to moving from Silo Teams in 2010 to team based inspections. Had two months of bumps but worked them out well. It took a full year for the switch.

SS: Once you have separate entities could cut down on response time for residential side, commercial new construction then the rest of us. When you have the residential team will be new construction and then replacements right? Change work then new structures come first.

JB: Using more MT inspections has been talked about by the BDC for some time. Efficiencies will include trip time.

CA: Is the MT still focused inside of the belt loop?

JB: Goal is to have MT anywhere within the county.

SS: Will you 'cherry' pick those on the team?

JB: We have already picked who can move into this effectively in multi-trade and growth limits.

CA: This is the right way to go; within these different groups are different inspectors going to have predetermined areas to minimize trip time or how is this going to work to maintain efficiency.

JB: Yes, assigned territories – projects. When the demand on said projects are extreme, will be able to provide help.

TH: Where do we stand with our 16+ vacancies in the field? Summer boom inspections will increase.

SP: Just finished a round of interviews last week with three potential candidates. We have 8 – 10 more scheduled interviews at this time.

JG: Running groups of interviews at about 8 – 10.

TH: Looking for the second interviews.

SS: Are candidates already certified or do you have to get them to that point?

JB: Both. Handling the mega and multifamily will have a benefit and efficiency to all projects.

TH: Just as a result of field efficiencies?

JB: Yes. Good question and a concern we understand.

Jim asked if members were comfortable with the Phase I implementation. We can park it in subcommittee RTAP / Best Practice or park it in the Code Compliance Task Force. First one meets tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. We need to know are you ok with proceeding the support of and where do we put the detail work?

TH: We are good with it. Both groups meet before the 29th correct?

JB: Yes they are meeting a week apart. Next meeting on the 26th will be able to wrap this up.

BC: Either one would be fine.

TB: Can you invite the Charlotte Fire Department, they should be?

JB: I called Rob Kinniburgh bringing him up to speed and have a department planning strategy meeting with him on the 26th and have invited the City Fire Marshal and the County Fire Marshal.

Since there were no objections and Bernice Cutler suggested this be placed in the subcommittee working on RTAP / Best Practice we are finished with this topic for today.

6. GARTNER/AE-GC-BUILDER TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION DISCUSSION

Jim introduced this subject then asked Patrick to discuss training. The agenda item addressed two topics; the Notes on Consistency and the Training Strategy. The report goes on to pose four questions to the BDC, industry and Department, including

- a) *What is the industry's responsibility on training?*
 - b) *Define the line in prelim meetings/precon meetings where we begin QC's industry work, for either small projects or large.*
 - c) *Is the Department the trainer of last resort in the design/construction industry?*
 - d) *Clear position by the BDC on where the Departments training responsibility starts/stops, and how to staff and fund the work in the Department's sphere of responsibility.*
- Note: the Department acknowledges our responsibility to train both customers and staff on both the process and use of technology. We do not think we are the primary training component for customer learning the building code.

Patrick asked BDC Members for feedback and specifically; does everyone feel industry as a whole (AIA/PENC) contribute to training associated people?

CA: What we fight against in the Architectural community our projects getting more and more complex and are being asked to do more complicated things in shorter amount of time when learning about code ramifications, example type III issues we've been operating on a certain way and you guys and other

jurisdictions have been approving those same solutions and we are coming back around with newest way of type III construction have been accepted as standard and not the way they are to be done. For us given the restrictions we are being place under we certainly attempt to do our code research this has to be a partnership with you guys together because the pressures we are put under are making it really hard for us to hit that independent level.

PG: My observation on type III, Mega are so complicated, what I'm seeing I want the Mega team to coach people through those challenges. When I looked at challenges of putting components together, I see the Mega team taking a new light for us. I don't think the Department is responsible for training

CA: Not training but knowledge sharing and discovery together, it's a collaboration. Don't think it's code enforcement's responsibility but a knowledge sharing collaboration on issues is worthwhile. May be training taking place you are participating in it makes sense to open up to the public and piggy back on that.

PG: We've always done presentations to industry. With everyone having their way of doing things it makes it difficult. I think the mega team will build relationship sharing knowledge and understand the challenges better which is why the team is so important.

BC: In the department and internal training for cost savings, you all are doing your training, firms do their training, and just like each firms have ways of approaching training a bit differently, our training/your training has no cross-over and does not match. If we can find ways to open up cross avenues; if you are training, we are happy to pay to come so we can participate in your training and how you're looking at. Knowing where you are coming from will help us when we build it from ground up.

CA: AIA has CE requirements but there is nothing specific about what that has to be. The AIA does not build and train directly as an organization. They go to vendors that can provide training and approved by AIA but almost always product representatives; different industry representatives.

PG: Asked to bring questions back; industry response to training.

BS: Please don't lose it. What is the County's responsibility? NC code says the designer will be confident in designing what they design

TB: I have no problem with dropping the hammer when we can. It's important to be familiar with the local code to give them better service.

CA: My intention is not to suggest that arch shouldn't be doing their job; we should continue to collaborate. When we are being pushed into situations in meeting a deadline and giving what the client needs we have to do a 25 week project in 18 weeks it's hard, you can have speed, quality or cost. You can't have all three. It's the quality that ends up suffering.

PG: I need to get to your challenge to figure out what we need to do.

JB: I think we are the only big authority in the state that offers preliminary and do not charge people for it. It's our commitment and it works. The problem is when professionals take advantage of that and are not using the preliminary code review to their advantage.

PG: Design sealer should be at preliminary for the detail questions; without it is a weak agenda.

CA: As a member of architectural community we take advantage of preliminary meetings and feel we are do our best but if you feel we are not; tell us what we are doing.

JT: Are you having more problems with contractors?

JB: In preliminary code meeting it's not happening they are talking constructability. The contractors in room out of the shoot in meetings talking about how to build detail and what it means from code compliance strategy and what are we going to accept; it's just not happening.

RB: When you have training and shut down; is the public allowed to attend?

PG: The monthly consistency meeting will tell you what is going on in the department.

RB: Three people show up. I'm talking about when you bring experts in to train.

PG: It's a CE required training.

JG: Occasionally we provide classes.

RB: If you send it out to AIA or PENC for \$50 a head we are having someone come in and you can join. You've got people like Chad that goes the extra mile then those that don't care and use you guys.

JB: There is little participation from outside in the consistency meetings. There are far more participation in the Residential Consistency meetings. When we are better at advertising the topic, we get a better turn out. Can't think of last time I saw an AE or Contractor in these consistency meetings.

PG: We should be able to share these opportunities.

MC: What percentage and who are the offenders?

PG: We have a strong AE approval superior rate which is very high; strong following of superior performers at about 85% those that take advantage of the programs we offer. Then you have those 15% that come in 7 times or hit the system 5 times in a year; takes up a lot of resources to work their problem.

JB: Three comments that stand out to me; one by Tom Brasse, first timers are different, John Taylor that contractors don't participate in preliminary code review and from Rob Belisle about letting industry know about training in Code.

Jim suggested two topics for follow-up, Item 5.5 will not be a short discussion and suggest tabling this till the June Meeting. All agreed adding to the June agenda.

7. CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON ALL AGENCY UMBRELLA P & I GRAPHIC & FEEDBACK FOR CITY-COUNTY JOINT TEAM

Agency Data Umbrella & P & I Graphic

- Request from Immediate Process/Technology Improvement Team
 - Soliciting BDC comments on:
 - Value of City, County and Towns collecting data on the length of time it takes to get through the entire permitting and inspections processes. Timeline would umbrella all involved agencies showing:
 - All agencies involved, including date submitted & date responded for all cycles
 - Plus the time a submittal spends in the owner's shop before it comes back in
- Customers currently have views of our work in both POSSE and EPS, including:
 - In POSSE, can see inspections status (requests, results in detail, CO holds, et al)
 - In EPS, can see plan review results (in detail in OnSchedule and Mega) and agency holds on permit issuance
- This POSSE/EPS screen criteria was designed by customers:
 - Who's general approach was they knew their team's time in their shop
 - Concerned about knowing the status of specific P&I events on our side (plan review, inspections, holds, etc.)
- Basic question:
 - Does the full BDC find value in this idea?
 - Would you be willing to fund it?



MecklenburgCountyNC.gov

This continues a discussion started in the April meeting; whereas the City & County have a joint effort, the Immediate Process/Technology Improvement Team that requests input from the BDC on the value of the City, County and Towns collecting and assembling data as to the length of time it takes to get through the entire permitting and inspections processes of all agencies, from early project inception thru occupancy. The timeline would umbrella all involved agencies showing Code Enforcement, W&LR, City & all other agencies involved, including date submitted & date responded for all cycles to include the time a submittal spends in the owner's shop before it comes back in. The thought is this could be used

two ways by customers and local government, customers would be able to see a big picture of the entire process timeline and local government would be able to compare pre and post-process improvements based on Gartner task force data. It is important to note that customers currently have views of our work in both POSSE and EPS. In POSSE, they can see inspections status (requests, results in detail, CO holds, et al) and in EPS, they can see plan review results (in detail in On Schedule and Mega) as well as all agency holds on permit issuance. POSSE and EPS screen criteria was designed by customers, there was some discussion about viewing everything from beginning to end, on the plan review streams as well as permitting. The decision both groups gave us (in 2003 for POSSE and 2011 for EPS) was that they knew their team's time in shop and weren't as concerned about that as knowing the status of specific P&I events on our side. This topic asks if that should be rethought, replacing that approach with an umbrella data system-graphic image, showing anyone average times for different type projects, overall, start to finish. In many ways it is less about the plan review-permitting-inspection work status, than it is about work on the owner's side, with all agencies. Since the vast majority of P&I events start to finish (and EPS-POSSE cover those), we think this is after a different information set, largely involving other agencies and project time on the owner's side of the fence. So the basic question is whether the full BDC would find value in this type of information and is willing to vote in favor of funding it?

SS: Are inspectors in the field resistant to technology? Grand plans then expect guys that aren't that tech savvy; in a perfect world you'd have a portal where we could see everything permitted to our business and when it is inspected and when the inspector will be there that day and don't miss hours when he's not there and you can't get them on the phone. My GC saw the inspector drive by and failed the inspection. Need some way to communicate with the inspectors and anyone would pay for that instead of having a closed loop with county on one side and the city on the other. A lot of times there is resistance because the inspectors don't want to use the technology they have.

JB: I think this is a different issue and we do feel it important to address that. When we give inspectors technology to use and they don't it becomes a performance issue.

SS: The process would still be related as far as the umbrella?

MC: Are you asking about the data from a number of different sources?

JB: This initiative will give the plan reviewers and inspectors a program that will live inside of someone's system that would have to be identical. It would collect information from Posse and from EPS and other entities operating inside of Posse and EPS but will also track time when decisions are outside out control and turn them into averages that could make sense to those trying to understand the timing. In a very simple way, architects and engineers asked for this a long time ago and now use the lead time chart so they can determine best time to get their projects in so they can decide on their side how they have to act. This will be that on steroids not just about plan review but other agencies.

BC: We've talked about that nobody has audited the process, nobody has gone through the entire process from start to finish and flow chart the whole process. These conversations were in and out the Gardner report. Do we have something in place to start doing that? Might not be a bad idea but may be redundant if we are doing that analysis work already.

JB: What Gartner is doing is recording their understanding in detail of how that process works now and will make a recommendation in a perfect world how that process works the best with supporting technology. One of key criteria it's very important for customers to see the full picture and not just one at a time. Most likely funded by the City and that becomes a non-issue. What I hear you saying is maybe wait and see what Gartner is going to suggest and could bridge this problem.

BC: Might alter enough process wise you are going back and doing half the work you did.

CA: Are you suggesting we wait till Gartner does their piece. It's a great idea overall. The two questions I have is the intent this shows up on the hour dashboard system or the city engineering or town's sites different locations or one place?

JB: Not enough discussion as to what it looks like. You can look at it as a graphic simple tool. Perhaps it will have a link on City web portals and our web portals. There hasn't been talk who would be at the throttle and they've asked what you think.

CA: Seems like it would make sense to locate in City engineering different towns and on our dashboards and include information from all sources.

JB: it's somewhat similar to the single portal. An information string they put their information into and anyone can see what is going on at one point and time. Was built on the idea we got from customers wanting to see where your project is with us. This is different in seeing averages in all the projects; single portal.

CA: What's driving the desire to have the owner's timeframe as well as the department's timeframe?

PG: They always ask us how long you're in house how long out of house and what department has it.

TH: Coming from the owner's group?

PG: Anyone, time in and time out. We don't have this information because it is manually done. Those things would be critical information for me when someone says it took 9 months to get a permit, and usually what we find out are delays in cycle events.

CA: Would give the department what that time out is so you know people are averaging 3 weeks between 1st and 2nd submittal, average 2 weeks to submit for 2nd review and time is not really from us that is impacting the schedule.

PG: All plans done and ready for 2nd review and I'm three weeks out. If you would have grabbed it earlier

TH: Is this evidence used to turn blame back on the user?

PG: Shows where operations efficiencies work and don't.

JB: This is not our idea.

TH: That would be a 4-5 person team (city / county / towns) a big effort and the customer is going to pay for it.

SS: you get it you pass it and has a timestamp how long it took, a rough idea about how long it is going to take to get a permit.

TB: How big a deal is it for you guys; are you going to take a sampling or is this going forward?

JB: It's very much about all the other agencies. We create that manually now. It's taking it to another level. Very similar to single portal and they want to know the averages on the owners side as well.

CA: What is the timeframe?

JB: This summer. Easy to say we can revisit after we know what Gartner has to say.

CA: Wouldn't want you to have to revisit this because Gartner has changed it.

JB: Seems to be a sense with members for Gartner to do their work and we revisit then. It's an aggressive schedule and not just data, they have to deliver County Manager and County Commission in governance and where are going with technology and is now on hold waiting to see what they suggest. It will be finished up quickly certainly not a year out.

TH: What if we said no?

JB: We want to know what you guys want to see when designing the EPS screens, what is difference about this. If you say no, we understand or you can say wait to see what Gartner comes up with.

TH: Will there be a technology fee impact?

JB: Have to find a way to allocate the cost of the developing the tool to those things specifically related to building construction fee, using surcharge of P&I funds to fund that and when goes beyond that we can't. The funding will be a complicated discussion.

CA: representing things from planning engineering towns is that funding come from those sources as well as our care or are we funding it all?

JB: To what extent does the tool get in front of the vertical P&I process or involving agencies distantly related, they aren't part of our fee structure and gets complicated. Gartner results will wait and see.

8. DEPARTMENT STATISCS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Brief intro by Shannon on new monthly stat web posted format made available to BDC on April 17TH.

APRIL 2015 STATISTICS

Permit Revenue

- April permit (only) rev - \$1,913,375, compares to March permit rev - \$1,751,987
- Fy15 budget projected monthly permit rev = \$1,716,109; April is \$197.26k above projection
- YTD permit rev = \$17,557,891 is above projection (\$17,160,887) by \$397k or 2.3%.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- April total - \$657,276,419, compares to March total - \$499,622,169
- YTD at 4/30/15 of \$4,651,474,917; 40.66% above Fy14 constr value permitted at 4/30/14 of \$3.3068B

Permits Issued:

	March	April	3 Month Trend
Residential	4518	5417	3893/3987/4518/5417
Commercial	2968	2871	2471/2327/2968/2871
Other (Fire/Zone)	613	559	363/456/613/559
Total	8099	8847	6727/6770/8099/8847

- Changes (Feb-March); Residential up 19%; commercial down 3.3%; total up 9.2%

Inspection Activity: inspections performed

Insp. Req.	Mar	April	Insp. Perf.	Mar	April	% Change
Bldg.	7091	7114	Bldg.	6958	7041	+1.2%
Elec.	7935	7982	Elec.	7886	7888	same
Mech.	4099	4018	Mech.	4080	3991	-2.2%
Plbg.	3538	3475	Plbg.	3484	3406	-2.3%
Total	22,663	22,589	Total	22,408	22,326	<-1%

- Changes (March-April); Bldg up 1%+, Elec same, M/P down 2%+
- Insp performed were 98.84% of insp requested

Inspection Activity: inspections response time (new IRT report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Mar	April	Mar	April	Mar	April	Mar	April
Bldg.	79.3	79.5	94.6	95.8	99.0	99.2	1.27	1.25
Elec.	57.6	56.3	91.9	90.6	99.0	99.0	1.52	1.54
Mech.	75.3	81.3	96.7	98.3	99.4	99.5	1.28	1.21

Plbg.	71.4	80.2	96.7	98.3	99.7	99.7	1.31	1.21
Total	69.7	71.7	94.3	94.8	99.2	99.3	1.37	1.34

- Per the BDC Performance Goal agreement (7/20/2010), the goal range is **85-90%**, so the IRT report indicates the February average is currently **13.3% below the goal range**.
- Though below goal, B-E numbers are about same, and M/P up a lot.

Inspection Pass Rates for April, 2015:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 81.56% in April, compared to 81% in March

Bldg: March – 76.55%
 April – 77.55%

Elec: March – 76.76%
 April – 77.57%

Mech: March – 85.94%
 April – 85.67%

Plbg: March – 89.35%
 April – 90.07%

- Bldg, Elec & Plbg up <1%; Mech down slightly
- Overall average up about 1/2% from last month, and above 75-80% goal range

On Schedule and CTAC numbers for April, 2015

CTAC:

- 111 first reviews, compared to 116 In March.
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 62%
- CTAC was 36% of OnSch (*) first review volume $(111/111+191 = 302) = 36.75\%$
*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:

- November, 13: 207 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.87% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only
- December, 13: 157 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96% all trades, 92.5% B/E/M/P only
- January, 14: 252 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.38% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only
- February, 14: 199 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85% all trades, 95.25% B/E/M/P only
- March, 14: 195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97.38% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- April, 14: 242 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94% all trades, 90.5% B/E/M/P only
- May, 14: 223 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–97.63% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- June, 14: 241 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- July, 14: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.4% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- August, 14: 248 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85.75% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 14: 189 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- October, 14: 239 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 94% B/E/M/P only
- November, 14: 194 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.6% all trades, 95.25% on B/E/M/P only
- December, 14: 203 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.25% all trades, 94.25% on B/E/M/P only
- January, 15: 185 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.88% all trades, 93.5% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 15: 192 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.75% all trades, 96.5% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 15: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.1% all trades, 97.5% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 15: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 96.75% on B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on March 30, 2015, showed

- 1-2 hr projects; at 2-4 work days booking lead, except City Zon'g at 9 work days
- 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except bldg.-18, MP-5, Health-5 and City Zon'g-10 days
- 5-8 hr projects; at 3-5 days, except bldg.-20, Elec-7, MP-20, & City Zon'g-15 work days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 5 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- Express Rev'w booking lead time; 10 work days for small projects, 10 work days for large projects

STATUS REPORT ON VARIOUS DEPARTMENT INITIATIVES

Status of Gartner/Task Force Recommendations

- 19 action items in total referred by the BDC
- Four resolved before TF started; 1, 3, 5 & 7
- Three fully addressed during TF's work; 9, 11 & 19
- CCTF reconvened on May 11 and is addressing topics:
 - #17 – high pass rate contractor reward
 - #18 – inspection trip time limits
- BDC Subcommittee meets tomorrow to address:
 - #8 – RTAP
 - #2 – “Best Practice” accountability
- In today's meeting, BDC itself discussed:
 - Review of Part 5 – item 5.5 from “Notes on Consistency”
 - Item 5.8 – training strategy
- Individual action proceeding on the rest, including:
 - #6 – describe and promote customer liaison role
 - #10 – check for P&I system input redundancy
 - #4 – training on process and technology
 - #12 – SI procedures
 - #13 – preconstruction meetings
 - #14 – consistency; field and office
 - #15 – customer notification use
 - #16 – code interpretation notification
 - Item 5.2 – communication plan



MecklenburgCountyNC.gov

We are creating a new subcommittee to address two topics:

- a) RTAP additional customer issues and b) “best practice” accountability measures
- Meeting is scheduled for May 20 at 10am in Clt 1&2. Invitations went out on April 30 to BDC AE and contractor reps, as well as interested AE-GC-Builder Task Force participants

Deferred discussion of item to June BDC meeting:

- Review of Part 5-item 5.5 from “Notes on Consistency”

The BDC had no objections to the following items, on which work is moving ahead

The following action items reference the AE-GC-Builder TF Final Report, Parts 2 & Part 5;

- #6- describe & promote customer liaison role
- #10-check for P&I system input redundancy
- #4-training on process & tech
- #13-precon meetings; part of Meck-SI changes, and contractor “best practice”
- #15-customer notification use
- #16-code interp notification; quarterly newsletter; BDC member associations reminded of consistency meetings through BDC notification.

- Item 5.2 – communication plan

Continue BDC discussion on all agency umbrella/P&I graphic

- Purpose of discussion is to give feedback to Immediate Process/Technology Improvement Team regarding merits of a timeline chart that would umbrella all involved agencies (Code Enf, W&LR, City, Towns & all other agencies) for all P&I cycles, reflecting both time in agencies and time in owner's team's hands.

UPDATES ON OTHER DEPARTMENT INITIATIVES IN THE WORKS

Electrical Plan Review Scope

- Current status; a re-draft of the electrical review scope document incorporated comments made on 1/26. On April 20, we re-distributed this to private sector meeting attendees for final review and comment.
- Having received final PE feedback, this part of the project is considered complete; topic reviews with managers and plans examiner staff were held May 14. We currently plan an effective date of July 1.
- Continuing work; the Department is also studying how we might lessen the permitting requirements for small projects; we will bring that study to the BDC in the near future. The general purpose is to delete review for projects that qualify under certain parameters, so that time and costs are not excessive in the permitting process compared to the project overall costs. An example of the proposal being discussed is;
 - *Allowing no plan review on anything less than a defined construction value (\$5K, 10k or 15K, pick one) on an individual trade permit. For electrical we could restrict this and not allow life safety systems, medical facilities or hazardous locations to use this bypass. This possible alternate would require that the contractor provide us with a definitive scope of work, a load calculation per the code and a fault current value for any equipment, signed and on their company letterhead.*

Hybrid Collaborative Delivery Team

We will push this report back to August due to our schedule on other things.

Customer Service Center Design project

- Significant time has also been spent with Gensler working on the CSC 1st floor layout in Suttle Ave.
- The design criteria are the 3 parts the BDC signed off on in the May 20, 2014 meeting, including; a) design criteria grid; b) how the CSC might work, and c) supporting tech list.
- Specific features included in the strategy are as follows:
 - “Tiered deployment” as requested by the CSC Focus Group
 - Interim space plan
 - CSC won't replace PM-CEM's ownership of projects, problems and resources to solve them.

Manager/CA Added Comments

No added comments from Managers or CAs.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The May 19th meeting of the Building Development Commission adjourned at 5:25 p.m. The next meeting of the Building Development Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, June 16, 2015.